

**LARRY DARNELL HILL, JR.,**  
**Plaintiff,**  
**v.**  
**ST. JUDE MEDICAL, et al.,**  
**Defendants.**

On January 21, 2021, plaintiff, appearing pro se, filed a motion to proceed in forma pauperis [D.E. 1]. On February 2, 2021, the court referred the motion to proceed in forma pauperis to United States Magistrate Judge Robert T. Numbers, II, and for a frivolity review [D.E. 4]. On February 9, 2021, plaintiff filed a motion for “immediation” [D.E. 5]. On March 26, 2021, Judge Numbers ordered plaintiff to particularize his complaint [D.E. 6]. On May 13, 2021, plaintiff filed an amended complaint [D.E. 9]. On June 4, 2021, Judge Numbers granted the motion to proceed in forma pauperis [D.E. 10]. On June 7, 2021, plaintiff filed his complaint [D.E. 11].

On July 6, 2021, Judge Numbers issued a Memorandum and Recommendation (“M&R”) and recommended that the court dismiss the action unless Hill returned completed summonses for each defendant to the court within fourteen days of the date of the M&R. See [D.E. 12]. On July 7, 2021, Hill filed a motion to order speedy trial and for defendants to contact plaintiff or identify themselves. See [D.E. 13]. On July 12, 2021, Hill filed proposed summonses for issuance by the clerk [D.E. 14].

Case 5:21-cv-00032-D Document 15 Filed 08/17/21 Page 1 of 2

Cir. 2005) (alteration, emphasis, and quotation omitted); see 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). Absent a timely objection, “a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Diamond, 416 F.3d at 315 (quotation omitted). If a party makes only general objections, de novo review is not required. See Wells v. Shriners Hosp., 109 F.3d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1997). In order “to preserve for appeal an issue in a magistrate judge’s report, a party must object to the finding or recommendation on that issue with sufficient specificity so as reasonably to alert the district court of the true ground for the objection.” Martin v. Duffy, 858 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir. 2017) (quotation omitted); see United States v. Midgett, 478 F.3d 616, 622 (4th Cir. 2007).

The court has reviewed the M&R and the record. The court is satisfied that there is no clear error on the face of the record. See Diamond, 416 F.3d at 315. Thus, the court adopts the conclusion in the M&R. Plaintiff complied with the M&R and filed proposed summonses. Because plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, the court directs the clerk to issue the summonses, and forward the summonses to the United States Marshal Service (“USMS”) for service. The USMS is directed to serve the summonses and a copy of the complaint on each defendant.

In sum, the court ADOPTS the conclusion in the M&R [D.E. 12], and DIRECTS the clerk to issue the summonses and forward the summonses to the USMS for service. The court DIRECTS the USMS to serve the summonses and a copy of the complaint on each defendant. Plaintiff’s motions for “immediation” [D.E. 5], and to order speedy trial and to order defendants to contact plaintiff or identify themselves [D.E. 13] are DENIED as baseless.

SO ORDERED. This 17 day of August 2021.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JAMES C. DEVER III  
United States District Judge